## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Shondreka Jacole Shippy,	)	C/A No. 0:13-1077-JFA-PJG
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	ORDER
	)	
Sgt. Blackwell; Captain Anderson; Nurse	)	
Margaret; Corporal Waters; Officer Price;	)	
Nurse Roanna,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	_ )	

The plaintiff has filed this action, *pro se*, seeking relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff, a pretrial detainee, alleges violations of her constitutional rights by the named defendants. Defendants Nurse Margaret and Nurse Roanna filed a motion for summary judgment on October 8, 2013, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. (ECF No. 46.) As the plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, the court entered an order pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975) on October 9, 2013, advising the plaintiff of the importance of a motion for summary judgment and of the need for her to file an adequate response. (ECF No. 47.) The plaintiff was specifically advised that if she failed to respond adequately, the defendants' motion may be granted, thereby ending her case against those defendants.

Page 1 of 2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The court notes that the mailing containing this order was returned as undeliverable. (See ECF No. 50.) The court further observes that the plaintiff was specifically advised of her obligation to keep the court apprised of her current address and the consequences of failing to do so. (See ECF No. 10 at 2-3.)

0:13-cv-01077-JFA Date Filed 11/20/13 Entry Number 53 Page 2 of 2

Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court's <u>Roseboro</u> order, the plaintiff has failed to respond to the motion. As such, it appears to the court that she does not oppose the motion and wishes to abandon this action.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED that the plaintiff shall advise the court as to whether she wishes to continue with this case and to file a response to the defendants' motion for summary judgment within fourteen (14) days from the date of this order. Plaintiff is further advised that if she fails to respond, this action will be recommended for dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute. See Davis v. Williams, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Paige J. Gossett

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

) Lyonsett

November 20, 2013 Columbia, South Carolina